School of Theology at Claremont
1001 1413024

THE CHRISTIAN MAN THE CHURCH AND THE WAR

ROBERT E. SPEER

D
639
R4
S6

The Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

DK
60



THE CHRISTIAN MAN, THE CHURCH AND THE WAR



THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
NEW YORK · BOSTON · CHICAGO · DALLAS
ATLANTA · SAN FRANCISCO

MACMILLAN & CO., LIMITED
LONDON · BOMBAY · CALCUTTA
MELBOURNE

THE MACMILLAN CO. OF CANADA, LTD.
TORONTO

THE CHRISTIAN MAN, THE CHURCH AND THE WAR

D
639
R4
S6

BY
ROBERT E. SPEER

New York
THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
1918

All rights reserved

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

COPYRIGHT, 1918
BY THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Set up and electrotyped. Published, May, 1918

There are three different courses open to the Christian man to-day. One is to throw his Christian idealism overboard, and postpone his effort to adjust religion to life until the war is over. A second is to hold fast to his Christian idealism and to repudiate the real world he is living in. The third is to take Paul's counsel and seek to behave as a citizen in a manner worthy of the Gospel, believing that his present duty is to be a Christian not in some other world but in this one, and that this duty can be done in the highest loyalty both to humanity and to Christ. This little book is an attempt at a statement of this third course. If the attempt is not a success, neither is life.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I	The Christian Man and the War .	7
II	The Church and the War . . .	32
III	The World Problem and Christianity	63

THE CHRISTIAN MAN, THE CHURCH AND THE WAR

I

THE CHRISTIAN MAN AND THE WAR

As a Christian man, holding the Christian faith and trying to live the Christian life, I believe that the war in which the nation is now engaged is a just and necessary war. Is this a consistent position? Can this belief be reconciled with the Christian faith and with the ideals of the Christian life? Is not war so fundamentally un-Christian that it can never be right? These were living questions to many men before the United States entered the war. Some men answered them unhesitatingly, yes or no. Others felt unable to do so, and so long as the obligations of citizenship allowed, evaded an answer, not knowing how they could reconcile the contradictions which seemed to them involved in the issues between Christianity and war. When at last the United States was drawn into the struggle

this evasion was no longer possible. Those men also to whom the case against all war seemed to be clear were obliged to reconsider their position in the light of the fact that the nation to which they belonged was actually at war. If these two groups of men were not prepared to take on principle and to hold at any cost the ultra-pacifist position, two other positions were open to them. One was to accept the war as a fact and to adapt themselves to it, leaving the responsibility for it upon others, but loyally contributing their full duty. The other was to review the whole case, to reface the moral issues and to discern, if they could, a righteous basis for the war and for America's participation in it.

To avoid misunderstanding, I venture to say that I have never accepted the position that in our present stage of social and political development all war is in principle wrong. The problem as it presented itself to me was not whether Belgium and France and Great Britain were wrong in resisting Germany,— they seemed to me to be in duty bound to do so,— but whether and when it became our duty also to resist Germany by war. At the same time I appreciated the position and the principles of earnest men and women who took a different view and to whom our entrance into the war brought

problems of the greatest pain and difficulty as to the most fundamental issues of Christianity and international morality. And I honor the struggle which many of these men and women have gone through and are going through now in an effort to be loyal Americans and at the same time to preserve their own moral integrity.

It may be thought that all these matters have reached a settled adjustment now and that it is needless to revive the questions which were active at the beginning of the war and which, if they may be stirring still in some minds, are checked and controlled there by the sense of political loyalty. This is a dangerous view, however. The fact is that these questions are as much alive as ever, that in the camps thousands of young men are arguing them, and that at the front they are arguing them still more. There the base brutalism of war is ceaselessly, sickeningly present, and all that is highest and best in a man's soul protests against its irrationality. There the horrors and atrocities are closest to men and while these nerve men to stern purpose, they also show them how abhorrent war is to humanity. There men are face to face with the duty of killing. The duty of dying does not daunt them, but the duty of putting other men, other boys, to death does.

The whole fundamental question as to whether war can ever be right rises up with a pathos and insistency unknown before. "—— has just returned from France," writes a correspondent. "He has become a rabid pacifist. Rabid is not the word, enthusiastic is better. He says that war is absolutely un-Christian, that no Christian has a right to have anything to do with war, either this war or any other, that those who believe they serve God by fighting may have clear consciences, but they are mistaking God's message." As we go deeper into the war, these questionings will not abate. They will increase. And the reflex influence will be felt at home. Brigadier General John A. Johnston has issued a timely warning that we must prepare for this. (New York *Times*, Feb. 27, 1918.) It is folly to be deaf to such a warning, to think that these questions can be met by coercion of any kind or by mob authority. They must be met squarely and we must convince ourselves and others clearly of the moral obligation of carrying the struggle through until the international wrongdoing which brought on this war and which has characterized it and against which we are fighting, is put down once for all and forever. It does not matter how long this may take nor how much it may cost, it must be done. And

if war is the only way in which it can be done, if Germany will accept no other decision, then by war it must be done, and the mind and heart of the nation must be intelligently and resolutely girded to the task.

The fundamental question which was alive before the war and which is alive to-day again and which will be alive when the war is over is: Can war ever be right, or is war in moral principle always wrong? That question will be alive until at last a day comes when the whole world will answer against war. When that day comes men will look back upon what we say about war now as we look back upon what men used to say about slavery. This book that I am writing, if a copy should remain until that future day of peace, will seem a sad and pitiful thing to any one of its happy citizens who may chance upon it. But this day is not that day. We are living in a world in which one great nation has deliberately repudiated the ideal of peace, built up enormous armaments designed for aggression, invaded other nations, with one, at least, of whom it had not only no quarrel but solemn engagements of neutrality. Our nation has been beset on every side by a whole world at war. In this world we have had to decide our present duty.

Well, the Christian man who wants even

in such a world to see truth as calmly and dispassionately as possible, will do well to set aside for a moment all but the bare general question which he must answer: Can any war be right?

The militarist answer, that war is a good thing in itself, can be rejected quietly. It belongs to a bygone day. If it were a living contention it should be assassinated and it would be. In so far as it is living we are fighting to kill it. This is the view which Dr. von Luschau, Professor of Anthropology in the University of Berlin, set forth in his paper on "The Anthropological View of Race" at the Universal Races Congress in London in 1911: "Racial barriers will never cease to exist, and if ever they should show a tendency to disappear, it will certainly be better to preserve than to obliterate them. The brotherhood of man is a good thing, but the struggle for life is a far better one. Athens would never have become what it was without Sparta, and national jealousies and differences, and even the most cruel wars, have ever been the real causes of progress and mental freedom. . . . No Hague Conferences, no international tribunals, no international papers and peace societies, no Esperanto or other international languages, will ever be able to abolish war. . . . Natural

law will never allow national boundaries to fall. . . . Nations will come and go, but racial and national antagonism will remain, and this is well, for mankind would become like a herd of sheep if we were to lose our national ambition and cease to look with pride and delight, not only on our industries and science, but also on our splendid soldiers and glorious ironclads." (Report, Universal Races Congress, London, 1911, p. 23.) This view is uncivilized, barbarous and false.

War for national aggrandizement, for the enlargement of territory, or for the expansion of trade is wrong. Such war has not been without its advocates. "In every part of the world where British interests are at stake," said Edward Dicey, in an article entitled "Peace and War in South Africa" in *The Nineteenth Century,* September, 1899, "I am in favor of advancing and upholding these interests even at the cost of annexation and at the risk of war. The only qualification I admit is that the country we desire to annex or take under our protection, the claims we choose to assert and the cause we decide to espouse, should be calculated to confer a tangible advantage upon the British Empire." And the same view has been expressed among ourselves in articles in the magazine called *Seven Seas* (*Seven Seas,* Sept., 1915, pp. 11,

13; Nov., 1915, p. 28.) "World empire," says the writer, "is the only logical and rational aim of a nation. . . . The true militarist believes that pacifism is the masculine and humanitarianism is the feminine manifestation of national degeneracy. . . . It is the absolute right of a nation to live to its fullest intensity, to expand, to found colonies, to get richer and richer by any proper means, such as armed conquest, commerce and diplomacy." We are fighting a great war to destroy this view.

War for national glory or national pride is wrong. The idea belongs to the same level of morals and jurisprudence as dueling. A nation cannot clear its honor or increase its true glory by war. If it has done right it has no dishonor to clear. If it has done wrong war cannot conceal it or atone for it. And it is a doubtful question both to the Christian conscience and to the political judgment as to whether it is right in itself or helpful to human progress for a nation to fight for its own material rights alone. We may venture to grant to the opponent of all war his claim that such wars also are wrong. If the rights are not mere isolated rights, but the rights of humanity, and if the attack to be resisted is made upon innocent persons and upon human solidarity we will take back the

concession. But we are anxious to concede as much as may be possible.

And with all that the hater of war may be able to say against the horror and shame and hellishness of war we will agree, asking only words with which to help him in his denunciation. It is an evil deeper and darker than speech. "I do not merely want to end this war. I want to nail down war in its coffin. Modern war is an intolerable thing. . . . It is disaster. It may be a necessary disaster . . . but for all that I insist it remains waste, disorder, disaster." (H. G. Wells, "Italy, France and Britain at War.")

"Well, then," says the conscience stern against war, "if you hold all this and are ready to go even further, what kind of war can be right?" And we reply, such a war as the American nation believes it is waging now, a war in defense of human rights, of weak nations, of innocent and inoffensive peoples, an unselfish war in which the nation seeks absolutely nothing for itself and is willing to spend everything in order that all men, including its enemies, may be free. This is a kind of war which we believe to be justified and right in principle in a world in which, at this time, these ends can only be defended in this way. War is an evil and is not to be tolerated unless the only alternative

offered is a worse evil. And to let the wrong have free course, to let might triumph over justice is a worse evil than resistance.

But this is the very issue with many conscientious Christian men and women who see all this as clearly as any one can, but who, when they put their difficulty into words, say these five things:

1. "It is wrong to kill. Doing it on a big scale, in the name of the nation and under the form of war, does not alter the fact that it is killing. War is the killing of others and it is wholesale self-killing too. And killing is wrong. The sixth commandment merely expresses a fundamental moral instinct of humanity." To this what answer can be made? Several answers. First, it is murder, not death, that is forbidden by the sixth commandment and the moral sense of mankind. The same law which forbade murder proclaimed death as the penalty for murder. And the moral sense of mankind has always justified killing as a prevention of murder. Second, life is a sacred thing, but there are times when some lives must be sacrificed that others may be saved. If the Turks are massacreing Armenians, the law of the sacredness of human life requires, not that the assassins shall be allowed to go on with impunity, but that they shall be stopped

even at the cost of their own lives. That is the way an outraged law works. Third, war is killing, but a war against war is a war against killing. It is a dreadful remedy, but if it is the only remedy, the greater wrong is in flinching from its use. And, fourth, the abstract principle of the inviolability of human life cannot be maintained. If it is, how can God be justified in allowing death or in inflicting it? Fifth, there is no law against self-sacrifice. Regarding His own life, our Lord declared: "I have a right to lay it down of myself." And of His disciples' lives He said: "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends." Would that not justify a man today in laying down his life for Belgium or for France? And last, life is not the greatest thing in the world nor death the most dreadful. "What is a man worse for dying?" asked Scatcherd in Trollope's "Dr. Thorne," "What can I be worse for dying? A man can die but once." Many things are better than life. Duty and righteousness and truth are all worth more than life. Happy are they who are counted "worthy to die for a great cause," said John Brown, "and not merely to pay the debt of nature as all must."

It is wrong to murder; as wrong as it is

right to stop those who are doing it, even at the risk of losing their lives and our own.

2. "It is wrong to use physical force in resisting evil." Why physical? What is the valid moral distinction between physical force and other kinds of influence? It is certainly right to use intellectual and moral and spiritual force to prevent evil. What is the moral difference in using physical force? And if it is wrong to use physical force in resisting evil, why is it not wrong also in doing good? Does any one think of maintaining such a proposition? And furthermore, what it is morally right for God to do, is it not morally right for man to do in God's name in the way of duty? God is using physical force every day both to achieve good and to prevent evil. Man may safely act in accord with God in this. "But all use of violence or of physical restraint is an invasion of the personality." But which is the worse invasion, a robber's, entering my neighbor's house to steal his goods and kill his little children, or mine, meeting the robber at the door and binding him hand and foot? Whose "personality" has the greater right to protection, his or my neighbor's? Even so clear and earnest a pacifist as Mr. Bertrand Russell sees that "the use of force is justifiable when it is ordered in accordance with law, by a neutral authority in the gen-

eral interest." (Quoted in *The New Republic,* April 21, 1917, p. 353.)

The moral end for which physical force exists is its use in righteous and loving service. The vital thing is the use to which it is put and the end it serves, not the resistance it meets. If I am going down the street and see a window coping about to fall on the head of a child, it is my right and duty to hold it back whether it is about to fall naturally or is pushed down by a violent man. The moral problem lies in having power to prevent wrong and not using it.

3. "War is contrary to the teaching and spirit of Jesus. 'Put up thy sword into its place,' He said to the man defending Him from arrest, who used force in the protection of the innocent, 'for all they that take the sword shall perish by the sword.' Jesus taught the duty of absolute non-resistance to evil." Yes, war is contrary to the teaching and spirit of Jesus. The nation that initiates a war is violating His law and His mind. But when it has done so, and war, violating His principles and disregarding and dishonoring His love, has been let loose, then does it follow that His teaching and spirit require that free and unhindered course must be given to it? Ask John what might happen then. He knew the spirit of Jesus and he

declared that he was in that spirit when he wrote what he saw:

"And I saw the heaven opened; and behold, a white horse, and He that sat thereon, called Faithful and True; and in righteousness He doth judge and make war. And His eyes are a flame of fire, and upon His head are many diadems; and He hath a name written, which no one knoweth but He Himself. And He is arrayed in a garment sprinkled with blood: and His name is called The Word of God. And the armies which are in heaven followed Him upon white horses, clothed in fine linen, white and pure. And out of His mouth proceedeth a sharp sword, that with it He should smite the nations: and He shall rule them with a rod of iron: and He treadeth the winepress of the fierceness of the wrath of Almighty God. And He hath on His garment and on His thigh a name written, King of Kings, and Lord of Lords.' (Rev. xix, 11–16.)

And lest it should be thought that these vast visions are too poetical, remember Jesus' own words regarding wrongs against the innocent and the just feelings and actions of human governments:

"And whoso shall receive one such little child in My name receiveth Me: but whoso shall cause one of these little ones which believe on Me to stumble, it is profitable for him that a great millstone should be hanged about his neck, and that he should be sunk in the depth of the sea." (Matt. xviii, 5, 6.)

"Jesus answered, My kingdom is not of this world: if My kingdom were of this world, then would My servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews." (John xviii, 36.)

We err if we think of Jesus and His Spirit in terms of compassion alone. We must think of Him also in terms of righteousness. He was love and He was also justice and truth. He did indeed surrender His life without resistance to His enemies, but He also again and again pronounced judgment both on sin as such and on men as sinners, as His disciples did in His name (Acts v, 1–11). He taught the duty of pity and unselfishness and forgiveness, but He never abrogated or compromised the principles of righteousness. Neither in His example nor in His teaching is there any warrant for the surrender by society of the political order of human life to the power of evil and wrong-doing. Men may and often must do just as Jesus did, in the will of God, but society may not dissolve nor ignore God's just and righteous government.

4. "War is an evil. It does not matter how it is justified or what it is fought for. It is always and only evil. It means economic loss and waste. It eats up the accumulated toil of the past. It consumes the resources

of the people. It destroys its treasures. It breeds moral disease. It poisons the blood of the nation. It accomplishes nothing. When it is over there is ruin and there is nothing else." Yes, this is a mild statement. It can be qualified perhaps in some particulars. But it can also be enlarged a hundredfold and its color turned from gray into scarlet and lurid night. War is an evil, but I say again there can be a worse evil. It is a worse evil to surrender to war, to let a war-purposing nation have its own unhindered way, to allow the principle of injustice to triumph. It is better to die fighting against Dr. von Luschau's theory of a world order than to live accepting it. The one war that can be right and not all evil is the war that will end war forever. That war is morally just. It is worth any sacrifice.

5. "Yes, but the only way to stop war is to stop it. You can't stop it by carrying it on. You can only stop it when some nation at any cost refuses to resist its enemy, or when some nation disarms and renounces war for itself forever." Some day this may come true. The nations will "beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." But until that

day comes the practical question which one nation after another has had to answer and, until we get war killed, will have to continue to answer, will be the question of its duty, resting in its own safety and peace, to other weaker nations in peril and distress. And the weaker nation may really be fighting the battle of the great nation which is at safety and peace, standing between it and its enemy. It is not heroic, it is less than honorable for a nation to throw on such beleaguered nations the burden of making a world-peace by the surrender of all that they are and have, to advise them to yield to the aggressor in the assurance that if they will do so war will end. For three years in this world war the United States refused to arm. It strove by every means to maintain peace. It scrupulously observed all the requirements of neutrality and of international law. Was it secured thereby against assault upon its citizens and upon its peaceful relations with other peoples? In a world that will some day come this will be different. It may be that some Telemachus nation may stop the last war, if this war is not the last, by sacrificing itself as the monk did when he ended the gladiatorial shows in Rome. But we have as yet no nation sufficiently holy for such a sacrifice and neither hitherto nor now has submission

shamed aggressive nations into peace. And while men innocently suffer the old question will recur: "Shall your brethren go to the war and you sit here?" And the notes of the ancient song return:

"And the princes of Issachar were with Deborah;
As was Issachar, so was Barak;
Into the valley thy rushed forth at his feet.
By the watercourses of Reuben
There were great resolves of heart.
Why sattest thou among the sheepfolds,
To hear the pipings for the flocks?
At the watercourses of Reuben
There were great searchings of heart.
Gilead abode beyond the Jordan:
And Dan, why did he remain in ships?
Asher sat still at the haven of the sea
And abode by his creeks.
Zebulun was a people that jeoparded their lives unto the death,
And Naphtali, upon the high places of the field.
Curse ye Meroz, said the angel of Jehovah,
Curse ye bitterly the inhabitants thereof,
Because they came not to the help of Jehovah,
To the help of Jehovah against the mighty."
(Judges v, 15–18, 23.)

One wants to deal fairly by the Christian man who feels these five difficulties. They are valid objections to a war of aggression. I do not see that they are valid against an unselfish war in defense of human rights.

But we can go further in our thought on the question, whether in principle war can ever be right in our actual world.

The past is a record of how God actually has shaped human history. Can any one deny that there have been wars which on one side at least were right? If there is any truth at all in the Old Testament records it is clear from them that again and again men were convinced that they were fighting with the very help and warrant of God. In our own national history, who is prepared to say that both the Revolutionary and the Civil Wars represented no right principle for which the nation was justified in contending even to the death? The New Testament itself recognized the legitimacy of military service for Christian men as it certainly could not have done without sacrifice of its moral authority if it be true that war cannot be morally allowed in human life. And in all later days many of the noblest and purest Christian spirits have been soldiers.

This fact that God has allowed wars in human history and that Christian men have been soldiers does not prove that war is a good thing and that it is to be accepted as a lasting human institution, a part of the divine order of the world, any more than the existence of polygamy in the Old Testament times

and of slavery in New Testament times and for centuries afterwards proves that polygamy and slavery are good things and divinely ordered permanent institutions. There is such a thing as world progress. What was allowable and even necessary in one day becomes wrong and intolerable in another. The day will come when war will be an anachronism, a long abandoned evil of the barbaric times. We are waging the present war to accomplish this very result. But until that day, so long as human law and human life know only the principles of our present order, war cannot be said to be in principle unallowable. God has allowed it. We did our best to escape it, but it came unsought and unavoidable. The facts of history justify it to-day. May it be for the last time! To-morrow, please God, it will be outlawed forever.

Not only does the past refuse to justify the view that Christianity and war are irreconciliable as yet, although God intends and we intend, by His help, that they shall be, but the fundamental Christian principles of trusteeship and unselfishness require resistance to wrong directed against the weak and the innocent. The wrong of war for selfish ends is as clear as sunlight, but in Jesus' words, " Resist not evil," there is no warrant for a man,

as Captain Mahan says, "to surrender the rights of another, still less if he is the trustee of those rights. This applies with double emphasis to rulers and to nations; for these, in this matter, have no personal rights. They are guardians, trustees, and as such are bound to do their best, even to the use of force, if need be, for the rightful interest of their wards. Personally, I go farther, and maintain that the possession of power is a talent committed in trust, for which account will be exacted; and that, under some circumstances, an obligation to repress evil external to its borders rests upon a nation as responsibility for the slums rests upon the rich quarters of a city. In this respect I call to witness Armenia, Crete, and Cuba, without, however, presuming to judge the consciences of the nations who witnessed without intervention the sufferings of the first two."

It is in this principle that we get light upon the teaching of Jesus about non-resistance. He clearly bade us to yield our own rights, but he did not bid us to yield our duties. If one smites us on our own cheek we are to turn to him the other, but if he smites a little child on one cheek he will not smite it on the other if we have the strength and love of Christ in us. Set in the duty of service we are to stand immovable, faithful unto death,

shielding the helpless, protecting the weak, overthrowing the evil.

Another New Testament conception which makes it impossible for us as yet to set up the thesis of the absolute indefensibility of war is the conception of the state as an ordinance of God. Paul held this conception firmly (Romans xiii, 3–7) and he did not hesitate to appeal to the state for military protection against violence and crime (Acts xxiii, 17-23). The Christian Church in the first century was not called, and never as a Church has been called, to go to war; but nations and ordered governments, whether then or now, are to do justice and to prevent wrong. Paul said this was the divine purpose of government in the case of Rome (Romans xiii, 4). It is not possible that God should intend a heathen government to prevent evil, but Christian governments to permit it.

And we cannot absolutely rule out war from the universe on the ground that it employs force and costs human life if at the same time we believe in God. If the universe is not moral, then, of course, no ethical question will trouble us. But if it is moral, if a personal God is back of it, must not the use of force and of human life in the progress of the world be warrantable if He uses them so? Can He not allow and authorize this

war? When he has educated us a little more we may be sure He will rule war out. The God in Whom we believe would have destroyed it long ago if He could have done so without destroying man too. But until mankind comes to the stage where war can be abandoned without abandoning the world to the armed wrong-doer, we cannot say that the use of war for righteous defense is wrong. Still against the armed man of evil-will one may sing:

> "Blessed be Jehovah my rock,
> Who teacheth my hands to war,
> And my fingers to fight:
> My lovingkindness and my fortress,
> My high tower, and my deliverer;
> My shield, and He in whom I take refuge."
> (Psalm cxliv, 1, 2.)

Let it be said again that the time will come when all this sort of argumentation will seem to men the talk of a forgotten day. It will be then the talk of a bygone time. But the day is not forgotten now nor the time bygone. It is the reality of life and duty to us. It is in this world that we are living, not in that new and different world. And we shall never bring that other and better day in if we do not do our duty now. Our duty now is to refute the false ideals of military autoc-

racy and of willful power, to check and throw back national ambition that ignores the rights of the weak and that aims at usurpation and dominion, to destroy at any cost to ourselves the principle of war, to deliver mankind from the unbearable burden of armaments and dread of attack. It is not tolerable to live in such a world. And if there is no other escape from it than by the death of men in war, let us die so, in order that other men may live in a different world.

But if what is said here is true and we are justified in this one more war to stop war, it does not follow that we are free to yield to the spirit that we set out to destroy. Precisely otherwise. If this view now allows and warrants war, it also warns and cautions and sobers us. It bids us be rid of our prejudice and passion, to chant no hymns of hate, to keep our aims and our principles free from selfishness and from any national interest which is not also the interest of all nations, to refrain from doing in retaliation and in war the very things we condemn in others, to avoid Prussianism in our national life in the effort to crush Prussianism, to guard against the moral uncleanness which has characterized past wars as against pestilence, to magnify the great constructive and humane services for which humanity calls in every such

time of tragedy, to love and pray for our enemies, to realize that the task set for us is not to be discharged in a year or five years, nor by money and ships and guns, but by life, that it is a war to the death against all that makes war possible. We have to replace an order of selfishness and wrong and division with an order of brotherhood and righteousness and unity. Whatever stands in the way of that new order in our nation or in our hearts is an ally of the ideals and spirit against which we contend. To tolerate or to conceal behind our armies the policies, the prejudices or the passions which are before them is disloyalty. To try to make our own hearts pure and our own hands clean so that we may be worthy of being used to achieve victory and peace is loyalty, and it is the only kind of loyalty that will stand the strain that we must now prepare ourselves to meet.

II

THE CHURCH AND THE WAR

THE problem of war to the Church is even greater than its problem for the Christian man. All that makes the problem difficult for the individual makes it difficult also for the Church and there is more besides. The social character and international relations of the Church and its sense of universal mission make its implication in war a tragic thing. The problem has become the more difficult to-day also by reason of the great confusion surrounding the character and work of the Church, its aims, its functions, its legitimate business. This confusion is illustrated in the conflicting criticisms which have been directed against the Church. On the one hand it was demanded at the outbreak of the war four years ago that the Church should explain why it and the Christian religion, of which it was the representative, had not prevented the war. If only the Church had applied Christianity to the hearts of rulers and to the relations of

nations the war could not have been! No doubt. Likewise, if chloroform had been applied to the rulers. But neither Christianity nor chloroform is self-applying. As the war went on and it became the conviction of more and more people in America that the nation would have to take part in the great struggle, a contrary complaint was made against the Church. Why was it so pacific? Why did it not fire the spirit of the nation and force the reluctance of the President and compel the entrance of America into the war? But the President had charged the nation to be neutral and had asked to be allowed to handle the intricate situation without pressures which would limit his ability to do the best for the nation and mankind. He was showing the whole world an example of moderation and restraint. Was it the business of the Christian Church to refuse loyalty to the head of the nation acting in such a spirit and with tireless purpose to preserve peace until it could no longer be preserved? Was it the Church's true function to precipitate the war or to support in every way the Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy in his policy to avert war if it might be possible?

The confusion with regard to the real nature and function of the Church illustrated in these colliding criticisms with regard to the

initiation of the war is revealed also in the various activities urged on the Church now. Many of these are not the duty of the Church at all. They may be the duties of Christian men. If they are patriotic duties they assuredly are the duties of Christian men, but they are not the business of the institution of the Church. This confusion is not all a bad thing by any means. It has three great advantages. It compels thoughtful men to ask what the Church is and what business it has to do in the world. It requires the Church to ask itself whether it is missing any true human service which it ought to be rendering, whether there are any wide human relations which it is failing to fulfill, or whether on the other hand it is involved in weakening compromises and is burdening itself with mistaken tasks. It reveals to the Church the loss from its disunion and inefficiency.

Let me speak a word as to this loss. Let the gains of division be granted,— the distribution of responsibility, the multiplied centers of energy, the flexibility and freedom, the room for the play of unity of spirit in spite of disunity of form, the possibility of progress through emulation and mutual attrition, and all else that can be claimed. There is on the other hand the indisputable loss. There are things that the Church cannot do,

influences it cannot wield, voices it cannot utter, moral demands it cannot make, services it cannot render. It lost the control of education and of charity through disunion. Our ecclesiastical condition is one which unfits us for this as for so many others of the social functions of the Christian Church. Our rent and divided Christendom could not take direction of the forces and resources of elementary education and of charity without such a waste of both as we already see in the direction of the forces and resources devoted to the proper work of the Church; and that the public would not endure. (Thompson's "Divine Order of Human Society," p. 175.) But the loss through this secularization is great. And if the Church were really one now, or were prepared to act as a unity it would render to the nations and the world in this special hour a service which nothing else can give and for the lack of which mankind will suffer for many a day.

But the Church can come nearer to efficient service of the nation and the world to-day, even divided as we are, by clearing away as much as possible of the confusion of our thought as to what the work of the Church ought to be in this time of war, and what its place is in society. We seem to have forgotten that there are three divine institutions

and we are mixing them up, interchanging and commingling their functions, sometimes raising unwarranted conflicts between them and sometimes allowing unwarranted alliances. These three institutions for which, in spite of the old-fashioned sound of it, a special sanction is claimed, are the family, the State and the Church. Their confusion is not unnatural. The same man belongs to all three, and he cannot separate himself from any one of them unless, of course, he becomes an outlaw from his family, an expatriate of his State, or foregoes his place in the Church. And all three of these institutions are religious, not the Church alone. The family and the State are as truly religious and divine as the Church. If any one of the three is to be picked out as more religious and of diviner sanction than the rest it is the family. It came first. It has its ideal in the nature of God. It satisfies more of the human needs than any other institution. It is the fundamental social unit. It is the goal of human life. In John's vision of the heavenly city, he saw the nations gathered into the family home of God, but he saw no Church there. And especially do we need to-day to conceive of the State not as supreme and divine in that German sense whose shadow we are pushing back across the world, but as a

divine institute none the less in its own sphere, and bound to the same moral law that binds men and as is witnessed by the Church. Citizenship is a sacred and religious thing. And these three institutions are confused not only because the same man is in each one, and because all are alike religious, but also because they cannot be too sharply differentiated in their spheres. Each glides into the others, and through the years there have been constant transitions of function. At first the school was entirely in the family, then it passed under the Church, and now from the Church it has passed to the State. The Church itself has moved through a wide range of relationships in connection with the State. But confused as these three institutions are, they can and must be seen in some distinction of function for the sake of each and as against the peril that the interests of mankind may be permanently damaged through the absorption by any one of the business of the others or the failure of any one to make its own distinctive and necessary contribution. Roughly, it suffices to characterize the family as the institute of the affections, the State as the institute of rights, and the Church as the institute of humanity.

Our concern here is with the last. As the institute of humanity what shall we say of

the character, the function, the work of the Church in America now?

First of all, the Church is not one of a hundred agencies. It is one of three. It is not a mere appendage, and tool of the State, to endorse State action just because it is such, to echo the voice of a contemporaneous political policy. Such a theory would soon reduce the Church to a nullity. Its members belong to other organizations which can fulfill these functions without the trammels of which the Church cannot divest itself. And these organizations can render a service of this character which would soon obscure any echo which the Church can contribute. Such a theory would destroy the highest service which the Church can render, which is to bring the State the immeasurable support of its independent moral judgment, upholding right and condemning wrong. If a war projected by the State is wrong the Church ought to condemn it. If it is right the Church should support it, not because the State has proposed it, but because it is right. On this basis the Church makes a positive moral contribution to the nation. On any other basis it undermines the nation's moral character.

But the Church is not a political judge and divider. There have been conceptions of the

Church which led it to seek such an office. In America we hold it to a different sphere. It has not been easy to do so. There are earnest men who from the outset of the war have dreamed that the Church might in some great utterance prescribe to the world the rearrangements of the life and relations of the nations which would end the struggle and bring us peace. But there has never been a time in this generation, surely not since January 1st, 1914, when any imaginable statement could have done anything of the sort. No statement can do it now. The President has made as admirable statements as can be made and he can be trusted to make others as they become necessary. What is needed is deeds. Only acts, words wrought into life and sacrifice, can avail now. Invaded soil must be restored. Immeasurable wrongs must be repaired. The dead cannot be avenged. Vengeance is mine, I will repay, saith the Lord. But a new world can be brought in where the innocent shall not be slain. But no phrases of speech or clever proclamations can achieve these ends now. We are thrown back reverently on a deeper word than any we can say, the old word which declares that without shedding of blood there is no remission of sins. More truth is to be spoken, but also more life is to be laid down.

If the Church is not a political echo nor a political judge, what is it? It is a minister of service, a fountain of moral life and duty, a witness to enduring and universal principles. And its faithful fulfillment of these functions now is needed as urgently as ever in its history. A deputation from one of the Churches asked President Wilson how the Church could best support him and serve the nation in this hour. The President replied by "calling upon the Church to remain true to its spiritual ideals and to glorify the principles of justice and of liberty which have given it birth."

And what is the service which in this maintenance of the moral and religious life of the nation at full measure the Church must render? Primarily and preëminently it is the service of keeping elementary principles clear, and especially two of these. Not long ago a friend, a newspaper man, described to me his views of the present social and political order and the way out. The escape was by the literal application of what he conceived to be the teaching and principles of Jesus, which he regarded as the only pure common sense which had ever been uttered. This teaching rested on the assumption of the absolute sacredness of life, and involved the consequent duty of complete non-resistance. He

was led on to speak of a conversation with his son, who had asked him whether a lie was ever justifiable and to whom he had replied that he had troubles enough of his own without being assaulted with such problems. When, however, the boy expressed the view that a lie even to save life was never right, his father had taken issue with him declaring that the obligation of truth was only relative and that to set it above the obligation of life was to make a fetish of a man's scruples and to sacrifice duty to it. My friend seemed to me, however, to have exactly reversed the moral principles involved. I believe that Jesus and the New Testament teach the relativity of the right of life and the absoluteness of the claims of truth, and that these are just the fundamental issues of the present hour. If the principle of life is absolute and of truth relative, why should men die for a cause, how can a cause ask men for their lives? But I believe it is truth and righteousness which is the absolute and sovereign value, for which alone we have a right to war, and to count life in comparison a secondary thing to be poured out without reserve. To these principles the Church needs to bear an unmistakable witness and to build them as a great rock under our national thought and purpose. If

presently when the sacrifices multiply and the toll of death is long, men do not hold, on principle, that life is nothing at all in comparison with truth, and that we had better all die than let wrong triumph, where will our strength be found? The certainty of victory is with those who see the principle of truth as absolute and uncompromisable and who deem life of value only for truth's sake.

The Church is not only a witness to the elemental moral principles. It is also a minister of unselfish service. There are critics of the Church who have been asking what it has been doing or can do when a nation comes to a great struggle such as this where, as it is explained, the real issues are material and economic, and who have derided the Church for its inefficiency and its dissensions. But the facts are different. Never before for many a day have the Churches been drawn together in faith and service as they are today. No other agencies in the nation were more promptly or deeply touched with a common spirit of resolve and duty, with a realization of the need of coöperation and concord in view of the immensity and the unity of the task in the army and in the nation. The necessary forms of common action were at once established. An object adequately great and single showed itself able, as always, to

unite men. Divisions, however historically significant, were seen to be outworn and unwarranted unless they increased the resources and capacity of all for the one great task. As I have said, there is still a long way to go before the Church is where it ought to be, but in two ways the Church is making progress thither and must make more. (1) First, by the principle of unselfishness and sacrifice. The war represents the supremacy of this principle over life, and many men have learned its supremacy over money. When before has a nation embodied the recognition of this in its revenue laws as we have done in the Income Tax Law section on charitable gifts? But we need to learn this lesson as to name and work and institution. In one of the army camps I picked up a copy of a short life of Huxley and read in it this statement of his aims, written in his journal, December 31st, 1856, "To smite all humbug, however big; to give a nobler tone to service; to set an example of abstinence from petty personal controversies and of toleration for everything but lying; to be indifferent as to whether the work is recognized as mine, so long as it is done." Those agencies, whatever their character, which act with such purpose will emerge from the war strongest. Those which seek in any way

their own gain or aggrandizement will pay the price of their self-seeking in a time when the law of sacrifice must be supreme. (2) Secondly, by the spirit of confidence and appreciation and trust. The task before the nation is too immense for men to waste time in mere negative criticism. It is a day for appreciation of what men are trying to do, each in his place, in the government and in private life. And the Churches must live and work in the same spirit. All of them combined cannot do all the work which is to be done. If some things are attempted in duplication it need not be wondered at. It is better that it should be so than that they should not be attempted at all. It is a day to practice the faith in our fellow men of which Paul speaks (Eph. i, 15). If we cannot do this individually, within the nation, and above all, between the Churches, if we are suspicious of one another and question each other's fidelity, or seek our own glory, how can we hope to promote international good faith and the spirit of confidence and trust between race and race?

And there are services which the nation needs of the Church to-day which, with whatever unity it can command, the Church must perform, and perform now.

The Church has a work to do in making

the army. The camps have not been established to provide a field for evangelistic work for the Church. But the Church exists to do, wherever men are gathered, the work of character building which is essential in creating an army. In a manly and soldierly address which he made to a group of new officers at Camp Wadsworth, General O'Ryan declared the three things requisite to the building of a strong army to be (1) personal character, (2) discipline and unity, and (3) equipment and military technique. The fundamental thing was morale and the fiber of character in the individual. The great foes of such character are the vices against which the Church and the nation wage war. Never before in history has a government thrown around the assembling and training of an army such safeguards as those which the United States has used in this emergency. The moral sense of the nation has been given a redoubled confidence in the government by what has been done. And it is necessary not only to provide just outward restraints and protections but also to supply men with inward fortitude and resolution. The discipline of the army cannot follow each soldier every hour by day and night. There will come times when unless he is fortified by firm purpose and religious principle he will be

found unprotected and will be overthrown. And all moral wreckage, the makers of the army clearly see, is folly and waste. To train a man to be a soldier, to spend freely of the public revenue to make him efficient in the work of war, and then to find that he cannot fight at all but must be supported by the government in a hospital, not only a non-combatant but an incubus upon every fighting man, is not warfare, it is military and economic idiocy. The nation needs religion functioning with freedom and power in and around the camps in its work of making character. And religion is needed not to make character only but just as much to make power. The best soldiers the nation has had from Washington to our own day have been Christian men. The Civil War produced no general of more remarkable power than Stonewall Jackson, and Colonel Henderson, his biographer, tells us of him that his " religion entered into every action of his life. No duty, however trivial, was begun without asking a blessing, or ended without returning thanks. ' He had long cultivated,' he said, ' the habit of connecting the most trivial and customary acts of life with a silent prayer.' He took the Bible as his guide. . . . He prayed without ceasing, under fire or in camp. . . .

He prayed for help to do his duty, and he prayed for success. He knew that

> " More things are wrought by prayer
> Than this world dreams of ; "

but he knew also, that prayer is not always answered in the way which man would have it. He went into battle with supreme confidence, not, as has been alleged, that the Lord had delivered the enemy into his hands, but that whatever happened would be the best that could happen. And he was as free from cant as from self-deception. It may be said of Jackson, as has been said so eloquently of the men whom, in some respects, he closely resembled, that ' his Bible was literally food to his understanding and a guide to his conduct. He saw the visible finger of God in every incident of life.' " (Henderson, " Life of Stonewall Jackson," Vol. I, pp. 61, 73.) At the end of his picture Col. Henderson speaks of " the consuming earnestness, the absolute fearlessness, whether of danger or of responsibility, the utter disregard of men and the unquestioning faith in the Almighty, which made up the individuality which men called Stonewall Jackson." We need the Stonewalls to-day and it is religion that can make them for us. General Persh-

ing evidently so believes. In his dispatch of January 18, 1918, he advised the State Department: "In the fulfillment of its duty to the nation much is expected of our army and nothing should be left undone that will help in keeping it in the highest state of efficiency. I believe the personnel of the army has never been equalled and the conduct has been excellent, but to overcome entirely the conditions found here requires fortitude born of great courage and lofty spiritual ideas. Counting myself responsible for the welfare of our men in every respect it is my desire to surround them with the best influence possible. In the fulfillment of this solemn trust it seems wise to request the aid of churchmen from home." The Church must do the same work here as in France.

The Church has a work to do in conserving the religious future of the nation. Its care for the young men enrolled in the army is essential for the making of the army. It is equally essential for the future well being of American life. The Government has justifiably lifted these young men out of our homes and communities. The military conscription law was one of the most just and prudent laws ever enacted. Once the task of the nation was clear it was the nation's duty to apportion that task among its citizens. The

financial burden was equitably distributed by taxation and loans. The burden of personal service was equitably distributed by the draft law. It would have been as reasonable to provide the funds needed for the war by voluntary subscriptions as to provide the troops by voluntary enlistment. And just as the allotment of such taxes is an honor and their payment a sacred privilege so the conscription of life was an honor and the acceptance of personal service a sacred preferment. If there was any error at all, it was in not making the conscription cover all other service as well as the service of the army. But this justified and honoring conscription of men laid upon the nation a solemn obligation. It was bound to see that the best influences of home and community life were, as far as possible, provided for these young men. Those to whom it is not given to die for the cause will come back again. They must come back stronger men, ready to carry forward the great traditions and institutions of our American life. Their homes and their churches feel that they have a right and a duty to hold them fast for their own sake and for the nation's sake, in the interest of to-day and in the interest of to-morrow. And all this is the army's own gain.

The Church has a work to do in enlarging

the moral values and in using to the full the moral resources of the nation. The moral aims of the war need to be clearly seen and the vision must not be allowed to fade. The nation is not fighting the war for the war's sake. We are fighting it for the sake of Belgium and France and Armenia and humanity. We are fighting it not because we love war but because we hate it and see no other way of stopping it once and forever. We are fighting it for the sake of ending ideals of false nationalism, of preventing the purpose of world domination by German autocracy. As an advertisement of the National Security League puts it in offering a reward of $1000 for " the best suggestion as to how to get to the German masses these facts:

We are fighting *for* the German masses, *not* against them.
We *are* fighting the Prussian Military Autocracy
Which is forcing thousands of the German masses to be killed daily —
The Autocracy that is making slaves of the masses
So that Germany can make vassals
Of the rest of the European Nations.
That Autocracy that is trying to rule the world by force,
The Autocracy that is preventing peace.
The United States does not want German land, money or business.

The United States is fighting for the Liberty of the masses —
For our Liberty — for the Liberty of the World.
And we will fight until we get

FREEDOM FOR ALL FOREVER."

These are some of the clear moral aims of the war. Many influences will obscure them. The Church needs to keep them clear. We are seeking nothing for ourselves that we do not want to share with all peoples, including the German people.

In such a struggle material and military forces alone will not suffice. There must be behind them and in them a moral purpose and energy and consecration which will save these forces from their own perils and use them for the great ideal ends which the President has stated in ways which satisfy the conscience of the American people. It is the business of the Church to awaken and sustain this purpose and energy and consecration. A personal letter from an official of the Government in Washington will state the matter better than any words which I can use:

"I have discovered that there is a very definite limit beyond which it is not proper for the Government to go in affirming moral ideals and mobilizing the mental and spiritual forces of the country for national service. The State and the Church are

officially disunited, and it is well indeed that this is so.

"But there is a point where the State leaves off and the Church begins. And I, as an individual Christian man, and not as a functionary of the Government, seem to see a great work which the Church, as a whole, might take up, at the very point where the State must, of logical necessity, lay it down.

"The national propaganda which must be put out to serve the purposes of the Government must appeal to men to volunteer their lives and their services in the national defense; to give their money to humanitarian work made imperative by the operations of war; to buy bonds which furnish money to build armies and navies.

"All this is necessary to be done, and it is clearly within the province of the State to do this. In securing these results it is also within the province of the State to affirm the accepted national ideals of liberty, justice, truth, fairness, and so on, and to appeal to the nobler instincts of devotion to the common good, self-sacrifice, and standing for principle at the cost of life and treasure.

"But, looking upon the net result of all this Government propaganda, I, as a Christian man, and not as a Government functionary, can see that it tends mightily to create throughout the country the sentiment that 'Victory will be on the side of the biggest army.' Therefore we must build the biggest army, and fight in the biggest way possible.

"The State, as such, can do no otherwise.

"And we see even ministers of the Gospel catch-

ing step with this idea which is implied by the Government propaganda, and emphasizing the duties of citizenship just as the Government is doing, which, of course, is all well and good, but they are doing it to the exclusion of their higher function of emphasizing the spiritual fact that, finally, and unquestionably, Right makes might. The biggest army that could be imagined must be wisely directed or its efforts will not win a victory for the Right, and the wisdom which is, therefore, the supreme necessity of the Nation, no matter how big its armies may be, is a spiritual quality, gained by contact with the Source of all Wisdom.

"To give emphasis to this fact, which all spiritually minded men can see is a national bulwark of the first order, is not the function of the State but of the Church.

"But unless the emphasis which the Church gives to this idea is national in its scope it will not be sufficient to offset, or rather balance, the effect of the organized Government propaganda which leaves the impression that we shall win only by having the biggest armies.

"Everything that tends in a certain direction will, as you know, keep on tending that way, and growing more so, unless something commensurate with it counteracts it.

"Now this Government propaganda must go right on; and because it stops short of spiritual things, and their relation to national success, it leaves the inference that 'God is on the side of the greatest armies.'

"It may not be the intention of the Government

to give this impression, and yet because it can not speak frankly of spiritual forces in relation to the final victory, it has the same effect as if the Government ignored spiritual forces and avowedly propagated the doctrine that 'Victory will be determined by Force.' . . .

"And yet, if the Church as a whole stands for any one idea about which there could be no dispute, it is the idea that God rules the world and the Universe and determines issues by the superior weight of moral and spiritual force rather than by the preponderance of material forces unsupported by Him.

"Now, it seems to me, that the State and the Church are not in conflict, but that it takes both of them to produce the perfect balance; and that if too much weight is being put into one side of the scale, the other side will go up beyond the balance, and the true balance will be lost, and with it all things worth while.

"The remedy for this situation, this growing tendency towards officially imposed materialism, must be found in the constructive action of the Church as a whole.

"The Church as a whole must be caused to see and feel that the very foundations of spiritual thinking are threatened if the idea continues to grow by State emphasis that 'Dynamite determines the destiny of nations. Therefore have plenty of it.'

"The Church must, if true to its responsibilities, restore the balance by demonstrating to the minds of men that no matter how big our armies may be they will not win because of their size, but because of

the spiritual force with which they are directed, and that the wisdom which will make them effective for victory can come only with being right in the sight of God, and seeking His guidance in our efforts, through organized force, to 'make the world safe for democracy.' Can you not devise an organized propaganda for the mobilization of all spiritually minded people, in the Churches and out, Catholic and Protestant, Jew and Gentile, to reaffirm the spiritual ideal that God really governs and that He will give the victory, at last, on the basis of right tendency, right ideals, and right action.

"The logical outcome of all spiritual ideas is reliance upon the power of prayer. Here, then, is the high point of the message which the federated Churches should give out to the people as an offset to the inferences being drawn from State propaganda. Let them demonstrate, by all the arts known to the Church, that prayer, and the righteousness that comes from right prayer, is what really won and established every great good that ever came to humanity. Show that Force has been an instrument in the hands of Righteousness, but that Force itself has not won any permanent good. Show that what we are fighting for to-day is to dethrone an autocracy which rests upon the assumption that Might makes Right.

"My heart is with you, but I have other work to do."

But the Church has this work to do.

The Church has a work to do also in steadying and holding fast the nation when

the time of tension comes. Superficial enthusiasm may suffice for a little while. Motives of pride and anger and indignation and interest may last through an hour. But nothing but an immovable and unselfish moral purpose will endure all things. When the long struggle really begins, when the casualty lists multiply and the shadows fall across the land, when the light hearted and the selfish grow faint and the temptation to take our hands from the plow and turn back with the furrow unrun comes in like a flood upon us, in that day God pity us if we have no divine faith secure against every strain, no purpose more firm and resolute than hate to hold us true. "Blessed be God," said President Lincoln to a Christian delegation in a dark hour of the Civil War. "Blessed be God, who in an hour like this giveth us the Churches." The Christian Church is the custodian of the forces which wear down and outlast death. All the merely materialistic energies and the motives and purposes which are kindred to them will go down in the time of the last testing. Like John Brown's body they will simply molder under us. But John Brown's soul? What did it do? What is it doing now? Through night and death it has come on and the fountains of life which fed that soul then will feed our souls now and

until this war is won. They can be fed on nothing else. We need in our nation now the sense of religion-nourished duty which sustained our fathers in the two great past crises of our history and which alone can sustain us, a sense of duty which, as Donald Hankey said, does not so much endure difficulty as deride it, a sense of duty which no power on earth or under the earth can relax until our work is done.

I will mention one other service which the Church must render to the nation in connection with the war. It must keep us from destroying for ourselves what we are fighting to keep our enemies from destroying for us and for mankind. We are contending against injustice and wrong. Can we be strong for this contest if we ourselves are guilty of wrong and injustice? We are fighting Prussianism. Would it not be a tragedy if in this warfare the very ideals and methods against which we fight should insidiously conquer us? The Church at least must believe in a gospel of truth and righteousness and preach that gospel inflexibly and uncowed. And a gospel of truth and righteousness is not a gospel of hate. Such a gospel is being preached to us. These sentences are from a recent pamphlet: "The only logical conclusion of Germany's career

of crime and dirty fighting is, at the close of the war, the contempt, the aversion and the loathing of the civilized world, and *a universal policy of non-intercourse.* Let Germany go and live with Austria, and the loathsome Turk, in a hell of their own. . . . Through her crimes and her dirty fighting, Germany has earned the contempt and aversion of the world, and it will be paid to her as long as civilization endures. . . . Germany, Austria and Turkey already have the contempt, the scorn and the hatred of the whole world, and after the war they should be ostracised and shunned for a thousand years."

It is hard to forgive the moral madness beyond belief which brought on the war, its enormous wrongs, its pitiful sufferings. It is hard to see how God Himself can forgive. But He can forgive, and His Spirit and His Spirit alone can enable men to forgive. There has been no more noble incident in the war, real or apocryphal, than the story, which Amelia Burr has put into verse, of the Belgian children coming up at the day's ending from their underground school to make their way down the ruined village street in the lulled cannonade of the evening. One older girl led the little flock. Presently they came to a still standing crucifix and like dutiful children they stopped for their prayer.

"Our Father," they began, and all went well as far as "our daily bread." Some of the little ones stopped there, for there had been that day no daily bread, but the older girl carried it bravely on until she came to "As we forgive them their trespasses," and then she too halted and stopped. A Belgian soldier standing by with his head bowed and his hat in hand while the children prayed heard a man's voice take up the prayer and carry it through. "Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive them their trespasses." The soldier looked up and lo, it was the Belgian King. If Albert of Belgium, wronged beyond us all, could forgive, and God more wronged than he, who are we that we should hate?

And hate and those who incite the nation to hate are the foes of our life to-day. There cannot be too deep hate of evil principles, but hatred of persons is bad religion, bad psychology and bad politics. Hate will burn up the national soul in impotence, and scorch the national conscience to cinder at a time when we need all our power of soul and must keep our conscience as clear as the sun. "Hatred," says a government bulletin, "many say, is an emotion necessary to war. The soldier, they say, cannot fight unless he hates. Let them ask the soldier; let them talk to the veteran who has given and re-

ceived wounds, and they will find that the greater hatred is among civilians. Passivity makes for an emotion of hatred; a busy man thinks mostly of his job. Furthermore, the characteristic of good fighters is that they are 'good sports.' They know the other men are ordered to fight as they are ordered, and the best soldiers are often those men who thoroughly respect their foe. . . . As a matter of practical wisdom, we want abiding truth, for it makes abiding conviction. Emotions may wave and surge. They are readily stirred by some story, some incident about some individual soldier. Frightful resolves thus are easily inspired. But let the next man come with a better story, let a superior orator appear a few days later and there is a reaction. The emotion subsides or even turns the other way.

"On the other hand, feelings built on beliefs, beliefs that are founded on profound convictions, and convictions dug deep into the rock of fundamental fact — these are not swayed and stirred like waves in a storm. Not an appeal to emotionalism, but an appeal to the emotions through conviction by statement of facts secures true converts, converts who when once convinced remain convinced."

We need all that the Christian Church can do for us to keep our ideals unsullied and un-

confused, to make us penitent for our own sins and to win us the strength of those who have sought God's forgiveness, to hold before us and to impose upon us the enduring and universal principles to which we must be true in our own spirit and in all our acts if we are to make those principles prevail in the world. I mean the principles of love and service and freedom, of a righteous social and economic order, of just human relationships in the state and among the nations. If the Church has no discernment of these principles or no courage to utter them we can do without it. If it does discern them and is not afraid to declare them, the world is ready as it never was before to hear its voice.

There is one thing more to say. It is said in a recent letter from a friend on the other side. "The Church here," he writes, "is in the midst of a vast and terrifying problem. The stage has long since gotten beyond the control of men. If I were not a Christian I would say that all is lost." Our moral duty in this war is clear, but we can never do it except by the power of God living in the Risen Lord. Our need has got beyond the power of man. No human minds or wills are adequate for this work of tearing down an old world and building up a new. It cannot be done by war alone. The war itself

even cannot accomplish the work which is allotted to it in God's will, unsupplemented by new ideals, new purposes, new conditions, new characters, a new life in men and nations. And that new life is available in one place alone, that is in God in Christ. To believe this and to try to live by this belief is the highest loyalty. It is the divine spring of the only national loyalty that can meet every strain and fulfill every task. Is the Church ready to pay the price of such loyalty in the love and purity and justice of its moral life in order that it may be the light of the nation in these days of darkness, the soul of the nation in these days of need?

III

THE WORLD PROBLEM AND CHRISTIANITY

THE world problem naturally shapes itself for us to-day as the problem of the world war, in which Germany and her three allies are arrayed against almost all the rest of mankind. And in truth the war does reach in its influence and make that influence consciously felt to the remotest corners of the earth. There are few regions where life in its most practical and pressing needs has not seen the consequences of the derangement of exchange and of the processes of trade and industry and the upheaval of humanity occasioned by the war. Railroads have stopped in the heart of the jungle because there were no engineers or materials to complete them. Children have starved in unknown villages for want of food which the war has delayed or consumed or left unproduced. The most isolated farmer in our own land, the tribes in inland Africa, country folk in far interior China, and the miners underground have alike been involved. The idea of a divided

human interest is gone forever. We know that for good or for ill the world is one and that it must live a common life. All that happens is of significance to all who live.

And the issues which are at stake in the war are of concern to all humanity. Whether power or service shall be the dominant principle of national life, whether the will to power is self-justifying and exempt from the law of righteousness and love or must be subdued to duty and brotherhood, whether all men are to be free to govern their states or whether a few men are to govern all men through the state, whether or not democracy is to be tolerated in the earth — these are questions in whose answers through this war every man in the world and all the men who are to come after us are concerned.

But while the war is evidence of the unity and magnitude of the world problem it is not the whole world problem. This problem was all here before the war began. It will be here when the war is over. It will be modified. We hope that some elements of it will have disappeared. But it remains to be seen how much war will have done to alter the fundamental qualities. War has its own alchemy and, as we know from our national history, there are some massive and permanent effects which it can produce. It can put

an end to some social and political principles. It can establish against resistance some contrary principles. But in the main the work of war is structural and not organic, and when this war has been won we shall find ourselves face to face with the old and ever new problems of life and sin. Human nature will be what it is. We shall have cleared the ground of some noxious growths and some intolerable barriers to true human progress. Human institutions will have been given an upward lift in the spiral of history. But how different will man be?

And even now while the war is in progress it is not the whole of human life. It touches all things, but it does not halt the movement of forces which will affect the whole future for us and for other nations and to which heed must be given now. It is said sometimes that the war is like a house afire and that all the owner's attention must be given to that fire. But suppose he owns several houses and while he is absorbed in saving one, incendiaries are kindling fires in the others. Our only relations are not with our allies in peace and our enemies in war. We have now relations with the Far East and with Latin America which must be dealt with in terms of long time. And within America subtle changes are taking place. Great interests

are playing their hands with consummate skill behind the unity of our national movement in the war. They are thinking forward and improving every opportunity to prepare the way for what they want when the war is done. Social and economic changes of the deepest meaning are going on. Are they to be left to chance or is thought to be spent upon their wise direction?

No episode or epoch in history is detachable, to be separated like a compartment. Every stage grows organically out of what preceded it and leads on organically to what comes after. In our effort to think of the world problem clearly in order to understand it and determine our duty regarding it we have to make the effort to isolate it and to separate its elements, but we need to remind ourselves that this cannot really be done, that life and history are an organic whole, a great web of tissues, causes and consequences, forces and effects inextricably interlaced. What we are living through now is the fruitage of the long past and we are sowing today for our children's reaping to-morrow.

In this view, if men do not prepare in advance for the solution of their problems it is too late to prepare when the time for the solution arrives. The forces of good which are to cope with forces of evil must be devel-

oped contemporaneously with them. This is the comfort of our faith in God. We believe that in our national life in the past and to-day, and in the life of all the world, God prepares against all human need and the demand of every human problem the supply of His wisdom and strength.

As we look around us to-day and behind and before, can we discern the outlines of the great world problem which must be worked through and can we find the forces which are adequate for its solution? This is not mere wasteful speculation at this time. We shall find that we need to carry us through this war all the inspiration and deep resolves which great aims and ends can give. One of our dangers is that if the war lasts long and our idealisms fade and we despair of accomplishing the results for which we went into the war, if behind the armies men begin to talk of our duty to develop and perpetuate among ourselves the very things which brought on the war and which have crushed the nations — that then the men in the armies will begin to say: "What is the use? Even if we win, we fail. Let us stop now." The only way to meet that danger is to keep clear and bright before men's eyes the hope of a new and different world worth any sacrifice. Motives drawn from the past will decay and

die. The-will-that-cannot-be-broken to make right prevail must be fed from hope and faith in a new and better day. Our Lord Himself endured for the joy which was set before Him. If the day after the war is to be like the day before or worse, what, men will ask, was the use of it all? Well, it is not to be the same day. But in order that it may not be we need to try to see what the old and long continuing elements of the world problem are and to find the forces which can contend with them.

One element in the world problem has been and will continue to be the imperfect development of democracy. We believe in democracy and our belief has a religious basis. The German political theory has rejected it and maintained instead a monarchical ideal with a definite religious and theocratic character.

"It is not at first apparent what necessary connection there is between monarchical government and Christian faith. For Bismarck they were ever inseparably bound together; nothing but religious belief would have reconciled him to a form of government so repugnant to natural human reason. 'If I were not a Christian, I would be a Republican,' he said many years later; in Christianity he found the only support against revolution and socialism. He was not the man to be beguiled by

romantic sentiment; he was not a courtier to be blinded by the pomp and ceremony of royalty; he was too stubborn and independent to acquiesce in the arbitrary rule of a single man. He could only obey the king if the king himself held his authority as the representative of a higher power. Bismarck was accustomed to follow out his thought to its conclusions. To whom did the King owe his power? There was only one alternative: to the people or to God. If to the people, then it was a mere question of convenience whether the monarchy were continued in form; there was little to choose between a constitutional monarchy where the king was appointed by the people and controlled by Parliament, and an avowed republic. This was the principle held by nearly all his contemporaries. He deliberately rejected it. He did not hold that the voice of the people was the voice of God. This belief did not satisfy his moral sense; it seemed in public life to leave all to interest and ambition and nothing to duty. It did not satisfy his critical intellect; the word 'people' was to him a vague idea. The service of the people or of the King by the Grace of God, this was the struggle which was soon to be fought out.

"It is this conception of government which underlies a speech which Bismarck addressed to the Prussian Chamber in 1848. 'The strife of principles which during this year has shattered Europe to its foundations is one in which no compromise is possible. They rest on opposite bases. The one draws its law from what is called the will of the people, in truth, however, from the law of the

strongest on the barricades. The other rests on authority created by God, an authority by the grace of God, and seeks its development in organic connection with the existing and constitutional legal status. . . . The decision on these principles will come not by Parliamentary debate, not by majorities of eleven votes; sooner or later the God who directs the battle will cast his iron dice.' (Headlam, "Bismarck," pp. 31–32, 53, quoted by Curtis, "The Commonwealth of Nations," p. 85–86.)

This deliberate rejection of democracy was the perpetuation of the political principle of the "Holy Alliance." The first article of the secret treaty signed at Verona November 22, 1822, by the parties to the Alliance read:

"The high contracting powers, being convinced that the system of representative government is equally as incompatible with the monarchical principles as the maxim of the sovereignty of the people with the divine right, engage mutually, in the most solemn manner, to use all their efforts to put an end to the system of representative governments, in whatever country it may exist in Europe, and to prevent its being introduced in those countries where it is not yet known." (Quoted by Curtis, "The Commonwealth of Nations," p. 87.)

Here, in the interest of a religious theory of government, democracy is rejected. If he had not been a Christian, Bismarck might have believed in democracy! We believe in democracy because we are Christians. We

have the Christian faith in man, in equality of opportunity and of privilege, in God's guidance of society and in the accessibility of the common man to the same divine direction which is available for a king. There is no more divine right behind a king than there is behind a carpenter or coal miner or bricklayer, and the massed conscience and conviction of many common men honestly seeking their onward way we trust more than the will and wisdom of any king. And we believe that even if the king were right and the mass of common men wrong, it would be better for the world to let the common men govern themselves. It may be a poorer government, but it will be a better people. We believe in an imperfect democracy as better than any alternative, no matter what it may be.

But the problem is to perfect our democracy. It is far from perfect now. Nationally and internationally it is inefficient. We have the advantage of its freedom of movement, its fluid adaptiveness, its hopefulness. But we have the disadvantage of its lack of discipline and coördination, its fickleness, its suspicion and distrustfulness. We count the gains greater than the losses, but we cannot figure out yet from our balance sheet any national or international millennium.

We are accustomed also to construe our democracy in too narrow terms. Who constitute the people? It is not simply the adult male citizens, nor all the contemporaneous generation. The dead live in us, and also the unborn, and they both have rights. The past and the future are our true environment in history. Loyalty in a democracy too often forgets to look behind and before, and pays the penalty in the inefficiency always due to an organism's imperfect relation to its environment.

Our democracy is deficient still in general economic justice. For a generation our life has been a long story of conflict between classes and especially between the classes crudely called "capital" and "labor." And yet the great majority of us who have had to bear the brunt and pay the cost have not really been counted in either party. The whole democracy has been involved in a struggle between two small minority sections.

International democracy has been unequal to the forces which have assailed it. In the summer of 1914 the great masses of common men in the European nations cherished no ill will, nation against nation. Their thoughts were friendly human thoughts and they desired only to live at peace in their own homes and to go about their own tasks. But inter-

ests of dynasties, which did not believe in democracies, manipulating the compulsions of corporate national life and working with weapons of secret diplomacy and of sinister influence which democracy had not yet wrenched from their hands, crushed into ruins the national democratic sentiments and plunged the world into a war which it abhorred. Crude and groping as it was, the democracy which the world had slowly wrought out would never have made such a mess of the earth. Other forces duped it. It is resolved now to take things in its own hands and to make safe room for its free development. But can it change and recreate itself? Does it know what it ought to be? Are its purposes right? Is it willing to make all needful sacrifices? Even if its heart is open to better things has it a mind to discern them and a will to replace them when discerned by still better things that will then be disclosed? If democracy is to be the principle of society, it must be a wholesome and progressive and righteous democracy.

A second element in the world problem in the past, from which we are trying to escape and from which escape is appallingly difficult, is the claim of national trusteeship to be above the moral law. This is an old, old claim. There was a time when it was set up

as a valid principle for smaller units than nationalities. Great feudal lords acted upon it until at last they were tamed by the movement of time and the moral law came to be supreme in relations between class and class and man and man within the modern state. The law was violated often enough, but its obligation was acknowledged and the acknowledgment has been working out its own enlarging enforcement. But the state was still held as a super-moral thing and this theory is one of the great issues of the present struggle.

In the very struggle itself the danger is that men may accept the theory in order to defeat it. And one wonders whether if one nation allows itself to act contrary to the moral law in order to prevent another nation from doing so, any real contribution has been made to human progress. There are some who say that we must fight with whatever weapons and spirit are necessary to achieve the end. To undo our foe we must outdo him.

"In order to crush this monstrous growth," says an English preacher whose message is addressed to his day with singular fearlessness and power, "what do we who hate it have to do? We have kept ourselves free from the more violent outrages of international law, and we believe that our soldiers, even

if they were let free in the flush of victory upon German soil, would never repeat the story of Belgian atrocities. But we do find that to crush an enemy in war one does have to consider military necessities before ideal principles. Fortunately we have a mighty navy which is able to exert pressure in a quite gentlemanly way. We can trust the chivalry, the humanity, the unfailing good humor of our men to treat the enemy when wounded or prisoners, with kindness and honor. But does any one suppose that in the frightful struggles of a bayonet charge all soldiers do not have to put off the civilized gentleman and fight like devils? The tragedy is that to crush this monstrous manifestation we have to adopt much the same methods and rely upon the same primitive passions. Whoever is responsible for recalling these things to life, they are not dead, and they will not be the quicker extinguished for the temporary license that has had to be granted to them.

"The truth is, behind the European man, not to mention the European woman, there is a savage, and if we are going to prepare for wars and wage wars, from whatever motive, then we shall want that savage kept alive. With characteristic frankness and brutality this has been recognized in Germany. It has even become a philosophy. In other countries, and notably in our own, we do not discuss this sort of thing. Like prostitution, it is not talked about in polite circles, but the safety of our homes is built upon it all the same. Germany has thrown over the restraints of sentimentalism and has in greater degree than other nationalities repudiated Christianity as inapplicable to State affairs and In-

ternational relationships. Other countries have not openly admitted this to be necessary, but in practice we all have to follow much the same course." (Orchard, "The Outlook for Religion," p. 6 f.)

In our inexperience and unsaddened idealism we do not and will not believe this. We had a great war once, the greatest of all wars until this chaos fell, and in that war soldiers and armies and commanders, North and South, bore themselves as Christian men. It was war and it had the horrors of war, death and havoc and destruction. But honor was alive and chivalry. And we still believe, fresh and untried as we are in this war, that we can keep the spirit of the days of old. And we believe it firmly in the case of the nation. The idealistic moral aims and the broad principles of political justice and the purposes of sincere world service which the President has stated again and again are accepted by the nation. We believe that we are acting as a Christian nation and in a Christian spirit. We are laying down our lives for our brethren. If we are not obeying as a nation the same moral law which holds between man and man we are self-deceived. And if any one among ourselves or among our allies is making the war a cloak for selfish or sinister purposes or, in carrying

on the war, is surrendering the principles which we think we are defending, he is deceiving us and betraying the good faith of America.

It is hard always for the true elements and ideals of a nation to control the nation's policy. There have been voices in our own land which have proclaimed the exemption of the nation from the law of absolute righteousness, and influential voices to-day advocate the frank recognition of the right of the nation to consider first not any sentiment of the moral law, but the supposed right of its self-interest.

"All modern wars between nations," writes "An American Jurist," "are in the last analysis founded on national interest and national honor, which are almost identical terms. Other causes may be assigned by political parties, and in popular governments other causes are often necessarily assigned when the citizenship is indifferent to the national honor or oblivious of the urgency of the paramount national interest. . . . That America was justified in her declaration of war for many reasons not stated by the President, the world, in the end, will concede. Her imperiled national interests alone afforded ample justification for such a declaration. But in pragmatic England and in practical America political and national movements are singularly promoted by sentimental considerations, sometimes pertinent, at others irrevelant, but always skillfully

manipulated by those more discerning public men who have closer at heart the national interests and well-being, and who themselves need no other incentive besides the national interests for even such an extreme action as public war.

"For the honor of humanity it is sad to have to admit that sentiment of itself is never a valid reason of state for extreme national measures. . . . It is the national interest and honor alone which, in the end, control the external actions of a state. In any discussion of the problems involved in this war sentiment, therefore, should be allowed to play only a minor part. Alliances between nations are not determined by considerations of sentiment. Common interests and advantages for the time being afford the sufficient inducement for either defensive or offensive alliances of nations." (The New York *Times,* January 2, 1918.)

But it is part of our ancient blindness to assume that national interests must conflict. If we regard the moral law as not binding between states and seek to build a world of antagonistic interests we shall indeed have perpetual strife. But we are sick of this idea and are ready for another long step onward in the way of human progress. We have our opportunity through the war to effect an organization of the nations which should bring them under such a just and mutually helpful order as binds in closer bonds the widely varied interests of our American Union.

"We believe," says the Report on Reconstruction of the Sub-Committee of the British Labor Party, "that nations are in no way damaged by each other's economic prosperity or commercial progress; but, on the contrary, that they are actually themselves mutually enriched thereby. We would therefore put an end to the old entanglements and mystifications of secret diplomacy and the formation of leagues against leagues. We stand for the immediate establishment, actually as a part of the treaty of peace with which the present war will end, of a universal league or society of nations, a supernational authority, with an international high court to try all justiciable issues between nations; an international legislature to enact such common laws as can be mutually agreed upon, and an international council of mediation to endeavor to settle without ultimate conflict even those disputes which are not justiciable. We would have all the nations of the world most solemnly undertake and promise to make common cause against any one of them that broke away from this fundamental agreement. The world has suffered too much from war for the Labor party to have any other policy than that of lasting peace." (*The New Republic,* February 16, 1918.)

And this is not the dream of Christian idealists and labor visionaries. It is the word of the men who saw all that brought on the war, who saw its full inward meaning, and who cannot bear the thought of the transmission of the present world order as a curse to our children.

"Permanent peace," says Viscount Grey, "has hitherto been an ideal; will a League of Nations or some concrete proposal of that kind become practicable after this war? Will the ideal come within the limits of practical, effective politics? . . . My own hope and belief is that it will. This war will bring about a new order of things. In domestic affairs old questions will be swept off the board of politics by new problems and new questions, to which many of the old phrases, the old formulas and previous points of view will not be applicable, and new men will perhaps be needed to solve the new problems. And in international politics new ideas may prevail, and things hitherto impossible may become possible. How much becomes possible will depend upon the change effected by the experience of this war, not so much in men's heads as in their hearts and feelings, and this we shall not know fully till the millions of men who have fought at the front are settled at home again and take their places in civil and political life in free democracies. . . . If as a result of this war men of all nations will desire in future to stamp out the first sign of war as they would a forest fire or the plague, then the world may have peace and a security that it has never yet known. If that is not the result, then the lot of mankind in this epoch of its history will be more desperate than in the darkest and most cruel ages, for civilized nations will prepare and perfect the destructive inventions of science, and these will be used to the point of mutual extermination. Militarism and civilization are now incompatible, and nations must attain some greater measure of interna-

tional self-control than has previously been thought possible if civilization is to progress or even to be preserved." (*International Conciliation,* November, 1917.)

The nations must be bound to the moral law.

A third element in the world problem is the retarding or the breaking down of the processes of social evolution and human progress for want of adequate agents to carry them forward. A case can be made out for theocratic government, but it is impracticable, if for no other reason, because no human agent can stand up under the burden of theocratic responsibility. And although democracy distributes the burden widely, the inadequacy of those on whom it is laid makes itself felt as surely and as fatally. We have not failed in the past, nor are we failing now for want of ideals. Our goals stand out clearly. We want peace and justice, equal opportunity, "the democratic control of industry," "the surplus wealth for the common good," and enough else which it is easy to describe. But how are we to get these things? There are no doubt economic and political processes to be thought out and applied. But will they give them to us? It is true that the problems of society and of the world cannot be solved

by good will alone. But neither can they be solved by economic or legal prescription. They require men both of good will and of intelligence, equal to the weight of the movement they must carry forward.

The acuteness of this need of men is nowhere more clearly seen than in China to-day. It is not clearer in America or in Europe. China is seeking to compass in one generation the experience which the Western nations have spread over two thousand years. There is no reason why China should not make this effort. It would be absurd for her to set out to travel the whole road over which we have come as slowly as we have traveled it. If she should try to do so, by the time she had caught up we would be two thousand years more ahead or, at least, apart. But the attempt to condense all this experience, to swing a race through such immense cycles of change in a single generation, is enough to make even the oldest nation dizzy. And the effort has broken down in one place and been blocked in another, not for any want of good will, or clear ideals, but for want of men. And the situation is even more tragic with regard to the women of Asia. A yet more rapid movement is sweeping them on. It may almost be said that they have double the distance to travel that lies before the men.

Where are the women who are capable of carrying through in a decade or two such millennial processes of transformation?

And this problem of China is our problem too. We know in part what kind of a world ought to be rebuilt on the ruins of the old. The trouble is that there are not men enough to do the rebuilding. The new order requires a new man. Saint Brice, caustically criticizing President Wilson's address before the Senate on January 24, 1917, declared in the Paris *Journal:*

"The situation would appear inextricable if we did not realize how the pursuit of a fixed idea may lead astray. Wilson is haunted by the idea of inaugurating the golden age of universal brotherhood. Naturally, general disarmament is the basis of this system. The only thing lacking for the realization of this admirable conception is a new humanity. Does Wilson pretend to be able to change humanity?"

Human progress does not need to wait for the total perfection of humanity. We have got rid of many evils even if humanity has not as yet been so greatly changed and we hope that we can get rid of war too with humanity as it is or as it is going to be after this war. But Saint Brice's demand is just. The President would doubtless join him in it.

Man himself is still the greatest element in his own problem. And if we want him changed after the war we must get him to work now on the changes that are necessary and to confront him to-day with the conditions which he will have to confront when the objects of the war have been attained and with which he will be able to deal then only if he has seen them and fitted himself for them now.

"The shallow objection that a nation at war must not think about the object of the war, but only about the waging of it, will be far from a nation that is at war only to establish peace. Nor is thought about the object of the war superfluous. For war depends upon prejudices and assumptions which are rooted deep in the minds of all men and women. It is not enough to wish to end war. We must root up the errors that foster it. And that requires a process of intellectual conversion which, if it is to be achieved in time, must be achieved even while the war is raging. It is with no fear that this book may weaken the determination of the reader that I lay it before him. It is in the hope that it may at once strengthen and enlighten him. For, though the war may be won merely by arms, the peace cannot. The peace can only be won by thought and will." (G. Lowes Dickinson, "The Choice Before Us.")

A fourth tenacious and evil element in the world problem is racial suspicion and inequality. The contraction of the world has in-

creased this peril. So long as the means of communication were few and the different races occupied separated homes, racial prejudice and friction were of small consequence. There was irritation here and there along the border lines, but time worked out tolerable adjustments even in the relations of subject Christian nations living in the midst of Mohammedans. But as the world shrank through the application of steam and electricity to the processes of inter-communication, the danger of race pride and injustice became ever greater and greater. The emancipation and rapid increase of the negro in the United States produced what Morley in his "Recollections" calls the hardest of all the "insoluble problems" of great states (Morley, "Recollections," Vol. II, p. 336 f.), but which has yet been handled with less friction than any other so great problem anywhere. Across a hundred racial chasms the last generation has witnessed the interplay of these passions of misunderstanding and distrust.

The old conceptions of the inevitable hostility of trade, of commercial competition as involving, of necessity, disadvantage on one side if there is to be advantage on the other, of the impossibility of friendly rivalry or of international coöperation intensify this peril

of race antagonism. The words of Congressman Mann in the debate on the Jones Bill relating to our tenure of the Philippine Islands, embodied these old conceptions and warned us of what those who honestly hold these views believe is in store for us. "I have no doubt," said Mr. Mann, "that conflict will come between the Far East and the Far West across the Pacific Ocean. All which is taking place in the world, the logic of the history of the human race up to now, teaches us that the avoidance of this conflict is impossible. I hope it will be only a commercial conflict. I hope war may not come, that there will be no conflict of arms, but I have little faith that in this world of ours people and races are able to meet in competition for a long period without armed conflict. A fight for commercial supremacy leads in the end to a fight with arms, because that is the final arbiter between nations." And one of our newspapers which constantly preaches race suspicion declares emphatically, "The war in Europe, hideous as it is, is merely a family quarrel compared to the terrible struggle that will some day be fought to a finish between the white and the yellow races for the domination of the world. . . . The only battles which count are the battles which saved the white races from subjugation by

the yellow races, and the only thing of real importance to-day is the rescue of the white races from conditions which make their subjugation by the yellow races possible. . . . Is it not time that the white nations settled their quarrels among themselves and made preparations to meet their one real danger, the menace to Christianity, to Occidental standards and ideals, to the white man's civilization, which the constantly growing power and aggression of the yellow races continually and increasingly threaten?" And this same paper has put its appeal with regard to the Japanese especially into verse. One stanza and the chorus will suffice:

"LOOK OUT! CALIFORNIA — BEWARE!

"They tell us that Uncle Sam
Would lie down like a lamb,
But he doesn't understand the situation.
He says war talk must cease
While he feeds the dove of Peace,
But he doesn't know the Peril to the Nation.
But something's going to happen
That will shake things up, perhaps,
If we don't start to clean out the JAPS!

They lurk upon thy shores, California!
They watch behind thy doors, California!
They're a hundred thousand strong,
And they won't be hiding long;

There's nothing that the dastards would not dare!
They are soldiers to a man,
With the schemes of old JAPAN!
Look out! California! Beware!"

It may be hoped that this principle of deliberate race suspicion and injustice will not poison and control our whole national spirit or be allowed to shape national policies. But there have been times before in our history when a spirit of racial unfairness has gained the upperhand of the day and of the wholesome good intent of the American people. Abraham Lincoln and General Grant believed that it had done so in the Mexican War. Our own country has the purest and most honorable history of diplomatic relations, of treaty making and of treaty keeping of any country in the world, but more than once we have failed in our word. Mr. Taft has summed up the record of failures in the case of China. Bishop Whipple tells in his autobiography of the long struggle, in which he was one of the leaders, for justice to the American Indian. Little by little his lands were taken from him. He was driven westward from the East and eastward from the West. Hemmed in by the encircling and ever-contracting lines of white encroachment his hunt-

ing-grounds were destroyed, the money promised him was squandered before it reached him, or, if it reached him, was made an occasion of debauching him, his manhood was ruined by the trade in liquor, vices of which he never knew were introduced, and the solemn treaties made with him by the government were broken. If this seems now long ago and if we believe that no such history could be repeated, we need to be sure that we are racially fair and just to the Latin-American races and to the peoples of the Far East to-day. We shall have no peace and rest in a world where the gulfs of race are unbridged by sympathy and confidence and generosity and justice.

A fifth element of the world problem is the resistance of national individualism to the spirit of world brotherhood and to the common interest of humanity. Human history is coming about now in one of its great cycles. In the Roman Empire men had nearly realized a world state and the Roman peace lay for centuries upon the Mediterranean world. But the Roman Empire broke down. The great adventurers expanded the ranges of the world. New states came into being. For five hundred years men were engrossed in developing the ideas and institutions of nationalism. And "ever since the world-state

ideals of the Middle Ages were left behind, this principle has been the touchstone of true statesmanship. The reputation of a statesman, as well as his permanent influence on human affairs, depends on his power to understand and aid the historical evolution, from out the mediæval chaos, of strong national states. Genius could not countervail this law of development. Even Napoleon was unsuccessful whenever his policy opposed the innate strength of nationalism. . . . The cosmopolitanism of the Middle Ages and of the Renaissance, the dreams of world unity, have been replaced by a set of narrower national ideals concerning customs, laws, literature, and art,— by a community of independent states, each striving to realize to the fullest its individual aptitudes and characteristics. It is not necessary to infer from this a universal reign of chauvinism. The idea of the general solidarity of mankind is still strong enough to restrain national action in some measure." (Reinsch, "World Politics," pp. 1–6.) Professor Reinsch wrote these words in brighter and more hopeful days when no men believed, except those who were preparing it, that such a day of self-wrought doom could fall upon mankind as we must live through now. We rejoice in all the gains of

this national differentiation in the past and we do not wish to lose them but we are resolved to find some way of retaining them and yet of saving a world community too. If this is to be done we see now that two things are essential. One is a new spirit of universalism. We may call it by many names. But however we name it — brotherhood, the spirit of humanity, internationalism — we have to come to it and to accept it as the new principle of human government and relationships. The other necessity is some instrumentality of international association by which the gains of a world peace in righteousness may be won and held without sacrifice of national personality. There are multitudes of men engaged in this war and ready to make any sacrifices for its just ending who will not be content but will think their sacrifice in some part vain if the war is not followed by a league of nations which, even though it be in the simplest form, will constitute the beginning of our international organization, which will advance disarmament, promote arbitration, secure the adjudication of difficulties, and prevent war. Humanity has realized that if one of its members suffers all must suffer. It begins to be resolved that if it must bear the pains of

unity it must have its benefits too and must secure them by the agencies which are necessary.

These are some of the long continuing elements of the world problem which must be dealt with after the war and which cannot be postponed to be dealt with then. They must be dealt with now also and the war itself cannot deal with them except in the way of clearing away hindrances. As the Archbishop of York said on his recent visit to New York: "War in itself can only destroy not build up, and it devolves upon the allied nations to renew themselves and prepare not only for victory in the war, but for the greater task of upbuilding after the conflict has ended. It would be futile to destroy the autocratic menace and then return to old conditions if that were physically possible. The new spirit, the spirit of humanity, of cooperation, of brotherhood, is needed if the full fruits of the war are to be reaped for the good of mankind. Nothing less will make the battling of to-day worth while." (New York *Times,* March 7, 1918.) Some creative power is necessary to deal now and hereafter with the ideas and forces which make up the world problem for us.

The Christian man believes that Christianity is the only solution of the problem, not a

tame, low-tension Christianity, but a root and branch type, a return to the dynamic reality of the faith as it first laid hold on men's hearts and lives. Such Christianity contains the ideals and the energies without which we can neither see the right path nor force our way onward in it. "Surely the future looks black enough," says Mr. Watterson in his editorial in the Louisville *Courier-Journal* on the fiftieth Christmas in its history, "yet it holds a hope, a single hope. One, and one power only, can arrest the descent and save us. That is the Christian religion. Democracy is but a side issue. The paramount issue underlying the issue of Democracy, is the religion of Christ, and Him crucified; the bedrock of civilization; the source and resource of all that is worth having in the world that is, that gives promise in the world to come; not as an abstraction; not as a huddle of sects and factions; but as a mighty force and principle of being. . . . If the world is to be saved from destruction — it will be saved alone by the Christian religion." In welcoming the Archbishop of York Mr. Root said as unequivocally that the fundamental issue is Paganism or Christ. And as Mr. Watterson says it must be the Christian religion in its reality. And that reality is not a religious system, it is a personal power.

It is Jesus Christ. "I am the Way, the Truth and the Life."

Jesus Christ was and is the righteousness of God. The Apostolic Church called him "that Just One." (Acts iii, 14; vii, 52; xxii, 14.) His first demand was for righteousness. "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness." Micah's idea of religion was not complete but it called for the first and indispensable essentials. "What doth Jehovah require of thee, but to do justly, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with thy God?" (Micah vi, 8.) It is because injustice has been done and in order that injustice may not be done with impunity or done again at all that we are at war. There can be no peace without justice on the earth. And there will be justice when men obey Christ.

Jesus Christ was and is good will. One of His biographies is given in five words, "He went about doing good." He did not go about seeking pleasure, save as He was pleased to do good. He did not seek power. He had it already and used it only for helpfulness. He did not seek wealth, though he taught men industry and thrift and made clearer than any other teacher the responsibility of trusteeship. He contrasted as fundamentally contradictory the pagan ideal and

His own. "And He said unto them, The kings of the Gentiles have lordship over them; and they that have authority over them are called Benefactors. But ye shall not be so: but he that is the greater among you, let him become as the younger; and he that is chief, as he that doth serve." (Luke xxii, 25–27.) This is the complete repudiation of the Nietzsche philosophy and the Treitschke politics. And it is the judgment of God upon all selfishness of class or person in every nation.

Jesus Christ was and is a principle of unity. He drew men about Himself in friendship while He was here. His "New Commandment" was a law of fellowship. It was not a canon of doctrine or of ecclesiastical government. It was both the pass-word and the power of a new brotherhood. "A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another; even as I have loved you, that ye also love one another. By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye love one another." (John xiii, 34.) From points of view made too familiar to us in the days of easy and barren optimism which have gone past, Christ's words are merely sentimental. They do not belong to the world of practical, economic and material interests. But they are the last words of true social and political

economy none the less. And we shall go on misleading ourselves by our own fabrications until we come to them and accept their simple and sufficient solution of our whole problem of human relations.

If we are to have an organizing principle of unity in the nation and in the world Jesus Christ must supply it. It was His purpose and expectation to do so. "I, if I be lifted up from the earth," He said, "will draw all men unto me." (John xii, 32.) No Church can do it until at last some Church unfolds which has Him alone for its Head and Life. Paul dreamed of humanity made into such a Church of Christ. "For in Him," says Paul, "were all things created, in the heavens and upon the earth, things visible and things invisible, whether thrones or dominions or principalities or powers; all things have been created through Him and unto Him; and He is before all things, and in Him all things consist. And He is the head of the body, the Church: who is beginning, the first born from the dead; that in all things He might have the pre-eminence. For it was the good pleasure of the Father that in Him should all the fullness dwell, and through Him to reconcile all things unto Himself, having made peace through the blood of His cross; through Him, I say,

whether things upon the earth, or things in the heavens." (Col. i, 16–20.) "For He is our peace, who made both one, and brake down the middle wall of partition, having abolished in His flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; that He might create in Himself of the two one new man, so making peace; and might reconcile them both in one body unto God through the cross, having slain the enmity thereby; and He came and preached peace to you that were far off, and peace to them that were nigh: for through Him we both have our access in one Spirit unto the Father. So then ye are no more strangers and sojourners, but ye are fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God, being built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus Himself being the chief corner stone; in whom each several building, fitly framed together, groweth into a holy temple in the Lord; in whom ye also are builded together for a habitation of God in the Spirit." (Eph. i, 16–22.)

Humanity is far enough away from all this now. And, alas, there is no church establishment on earth which greatly resembles it. But the principle is here and it is more nearly realized in the Christian Church even as we have it than in any other institution or

idea. And the war has brought sight of it to many men — not enough to change the world greatly but still enough to make sure that it will be changed some.

Jesus Christ was and is the embodiment of truth about life and of a spirit of life which in spite of all the tragedy of war and even through the tragedy of war human hearts now widely discern and feel. A godly old man in one of the harassed neutral countries of Europe tries to sum up in a letter what he thinks he sees:

"Let me precise," he says quaintly, "some points regarding the influence of the war on the Church.

"1. Especially in the beginning but also afterwards many have been unpleasantly surprised to see that life is more earnest than they ever dreamt of. I do not think that fear has any really good and reliable moral and religious results, but the distress of these times has turned many hearts to a more serious conception of life, to Christian thoughts, to feel their need of the message of the Gospel. A French friend told me that in the trenches modern literature became tedious and nauseous to him, he could only read the Bible and the classics. I have seen this in fine modern souls not only in belligerent countries but also here in our country.

"2. Modern dogmas have failed. Many thought that our civilization went by itself comfortably to heaven. Now they see that it goes to hell, that it must take another path, in order to get saved. Is

evil real? The Christian struggle against evil must be more recognized than it was before the war in modern thought.

"3. But at the same time the message of the Church about atonement, vicarious suffering, redeeming love and the enigma of sacrifice has become evident as never before to many minds that despised such Christian ideas as foolish antiquities and that see now that those experiences touch the very deepest realities of life.

"4. Notwithstanding cruel enmities, hatred and crimes I think that human solidarity has never been as evidently and deeply recognized as now. It may be that a day will come when humanity has forgotten all the blood and the tears shed now but will bless the victory of Christian principles in international intercourse.

"Such facts have turned many hearts to Christianity. They constrain the Church to contrition and repentance and to loving service. But they give her also wonderful tasks. Therefore I consider it as a holy, but most difficult duty, to make for a common confession of the Church of the supernational importance of Christ's cross."

Jesus Christ is the inspiration of what is true and worthy in the conception of nationalism. The specialization of achievement and of service which is the true function of nationalism draws sanction and power from the spirit and principles of Christ. But Christ's spirit transcends all that is exclusive and selfish in the nationalistic idea and purifies it of

false ambition and wrong. He lays the law of service and of sacrifice upon nations as upon men. It is significant that in this strain of war the nations have turned in evil hours to their old tribal gods but in every hour of sacrifice to the Christ crucified or to the white figure of the Risen Lord.

Jesus Christ was and is the solution of the race problem. Is there any other? He teaches races not to subject and exploit but to befriend and serve one another. Nations have been slow to accept this as a principle of statecraft. To maintain troops on alien soil in the necessity of war has been within the constitutional prerogative of the state but to give help in education in days of peace in order to escape the possibility of war has seemed a project of unreality. It would be the most obvious of realities when race relations are converted to Christ. He encourages human trust and confidence. Faith once established toward Him extends to other men. The apostolic communities were not content to sing to God "My faith looks up to Thee." Their faith looked out also toward man. And multitudes of men for the first time believed in themselves because some fellow Christian believed in them for Christ's sake.

And Christ was not content to deal in pre-

cepts on the problem of race. He had a great and far reaching spiritual purpose to which, in his conception of a biologically unified humanity, Paul gave his whole soul and all the great effort of his life. "I have other sheep," Jesus put it, "which are not of this fold. Them also I must bring and they shall hear my voice and they shall become one flock, one shepherd." (John x, 16.) But He carries His conception further than the metaphor of a flock. "I am the Vine, ye are the branches. Abide in Me and I in you." (John xv, 4, 5.) And Paul states the great principle in still another form. He sees man idealized in a "new man that is being renewed unto knowledge after the image of Him that created Him: where there cannot be Greek and Jew, circumcision and uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bondman, freeman; but Christ is all, and in all." (Col. iii, 10, 11.) This may seem hopelessly mystical, beyond connection with any plan of practical politics. But we shall have to come to it or go on paying the price of missing it. The race problem has only three solutions for us,— laissez faire, with the penalty in the future just what it has always been, miscegenation, with its impossible loss of so many of the gains of the racial differentiation and social progress of the past, and Christianity.

Jesus Christ is the one solution of the world problem because He is the one Saviour of men. And the root of the whole matter is that men have to be made over again, and that Christ alone can do it. The world has not believed this. It has worked out all sorts of political and social arrangements and turned to education, government, trade, a dozen different devices to bring in the golden age. It has all been a failure.

The Christian Church has done a little better. For a generation it has professed to believe in the duty of service and the law of brotherhood. But the profession while sincere has lacked the one essential tap root. "In my judgment," said Admiral Mahan, "the Church of to-day, laity and clergy, have made the capital mistake in generalship of reversing the two great commandments of the law; the two fundamental principles of her war, established by Christ Himself. Practically, as I observe, the laity hold, and the clergy teach, that the first and great commandment is 'Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.' Incidentally thereto, it is admitted, 'Thou shouldst love the Lord thy God.' It is of course too egregious an absurdity openly to call that the second commandment. It is simply quietly relegated to a secondary place.

"Is not the judgment of the world one of indifferent contempt for a man who is trying to save his own soul — his miserable soul, as I have sometimes read? And yet what is a man's soul? It is the one thing inexpressibly dear to God, for which, if there had been but one, He was content to give His Son, and this He has intrusted to the man as his own particular charge; I do not say his only charge, but the one clearly and solely committed to him to make the most of it. It is the talent which he is to multiply by diligent care; not that he may delight in it himself, but that he may present it to God through Jesus Christ. . . . Because care of one's own soul, by internal effort and discipline, seemed selfish, men have rushed to the extreme of finding in external action, in organized benevolence, in philanthropic effort, in the love of the neighbor — and particularly of the neighbor's body, for the neighbor's soul was naturally of not more account than one's own — not merely the fruit of Christian life, but the Christian life itself. That the kingdom of God is within you, an individual matter primarily and in essence, and only in consequence, and incidentally external, as all activity is but a manifestation of life, and not life itself — all this was forgotten. This I conceive to be the state of the Church now."

And what the Church may have forgot, the world was not likely to remember.

Will the Church remember now and lift the light of its witness before the nations? And will the nations accept or reject its witness? Will it be again as it was once before or different?

Shall it be now as then, "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings and ye would not! Behold your house is left unto you desolate. For I say unto you, you shall not see Me henceforth, till ye shall say, Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord." (Matt. xxiii, 37–39.)

Or shall it be that august word, "The voice of a great multitude, and as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of mighty thunders, saying, Hallelujah: for the Lord our God, the Almighty, reignest. Let us rejoice and be exceeding glad, and let us give the glory unto Him: for the marriage of the Lamb is come, and his wife hath made herself ready. And it was given unto her that she should array herself in fine linen, bright and pure: for the fine linen is the righteous acts of the saints. And he saith unto me, Write, Blessed are they that are bidden to the mar-

riage supper of the Lamb." (Rev. xix, 6–9.)

"This is mere rhapsody," says Practical Politics.

"This is the ultimate practical politics," says History.

THE END

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

THEOLOGY LIBRAR
CLAREMONT, CALI
A27978

The Church and the Man

By DONALD HANKEY
Author of "A Student in Arms"

Cloth, 12mo, 60 cents

"Donald Hankey, in his *The Church and the Man*, strengthens the hold on our affections won through his earlier book, *A Student in Arms*. In this new volume are eight brief papers all filled with the wise sincerity of a religious conviction that cares little for creed and miracle, that finds the whole *vade mecum* of life in the simple facts of Christ's active work among men. And a belief of that kind is the only one that fits all men through its divine perfection of service. It was his hope, as it is to-day that of thousands of men, that out of this war will emerge a renaissance of faith in the possibility of uplifting, bettering masses through the coming down to all levels and sharing burdens."— *Boston Transcript*.

"I think every Y. M. C. A. worker and Chaplain and every one connected with men's religious work should make use of this volume. It expresses and answers some of the chief problems men have to face, and I earnestly commend it to all intelligent laymen and ministers anxious for the welfare of our boys. Such a volume as this shows us how our young men are pointing us to God."— *S. Parkes Cadman*.

The object of the little book is, as the author says in his opening sentences, "to try to help find out how we can make the church a better, a more efficient, a more vital, a more healthy body." An Average Man's Beliefs, The Troubles of An Average Layman, The Gospel and The Church, Methods and Weapons, Revelations and Common Sense, The Church and Human Relations and Missions are taken up in successive chapters. There is also an introduction by C. H. S. Mathews, in which Mr. Hankey's life is briefly reviewed.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
Publishers 64–66 Fifth Avenue New York

The New Horizon of Church and State

By WILLIAM HERBERT PERRY FAUNCE

President of Brown University, and Author of "The Educational Ideal in the Ministry"

Cloth, 12mo

President Faunce takes up in his book four interesting topics: first, The Return of America to the Founders; second, The Return of Christianity to Christ; third, The Function of the Christian Patriot; and finally, Obstacles to the International Mind. The author's wide scholarship, keenly analytical mind and his close relationship with movements of the day, have combined to make a thoroughly significant volume.

The Apostles' Creed Today

By EDWARD S. DROWN

Cloth, 12mo, $1.00

"An able though popular discussion of the various problems that arise in connection with the continued use of the Apostles' Creed in the public services of various churches at the present day."— W. J. McGlothlin in *The Review and Expositor.*

"Dr. Drown shows how the different articles of the Creed embody universal truths. The purpose of the creed is to set forth Christ, and its acceptance becomes primarily an expression of loyalty to Him. That makes the acceptance not an irksome fetter but a delightful bond of fellowship, and fellowship is the deep human need that called the church itself into existence."— *Cleveland Leader.*

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Publishers 64–66 Fifth Avenue New York

Patriotism and Religion

By SHAILER MATHEWS

Professor of Historical and Comparative Theology and Dean of the Divinity School, University of Chicago

Cloth, 12mo

The close relationship between religion and patriotism is Dr. Mathews' theme in this volume. His purpose, essentially, is to indicate just what a religion for war-time really is. There are few whose interests and training fit them to write on such a subject as this so splendidly as does Dr. Mathews, and his book is one which will meet with the commendation of all thoughtful students of the hour.

The Religious Education of An American Citizen

By FRANCIS GREENWOOD PEABODY

Cloth, 12mo, $1.25

"Devoting the first half of the book to the child in the home, the boy, the student, a survey of universities in their social conscience, and the training for citizenship and American character, Dr. Peabody passes into excursions on discipline, power, perspective, the expansion of religion, the conversion of militarism and the place of Jesus Christ in a religious experience. There are few minds which can equal Professor Peabody's in kindling working enthusiasm and virilizing religious thought."— *Christian Register.*

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
Publishers 64–66 Fifth Avenue New York

Religion in a World at War

By GEORGE HODGES

Dean of the Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Massachusetts

Cloth, 12mo, $1.00

Genuine comfort and inspiration for the sincere believer are contained in this new work by Dean Hodges. Its central thought is summed up in the following passage:

"The idea that faith has entered now into an unprecedented peril, and that belief in the power and goodness of God must perish from the creeds of men, can be held only by those who are unacquainted with history."

The scope of the book, rising from the consideration of the world's bitter ordeal to a sublime conception of the Christian religion as the living manifestation of righteousness, is suggested by the chapter headings: In the Storm of War. Easter in a World at War. Memorial Day in a World at War. All Saints' Day in a World at War. Christmas in a World at War. God and the World's Pain. Pain and the World's Progress. The Everlasting Vitality of the Christian Religion.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Publishers 64–66 Fifth Avenue New York

0
539
R4
86

Speer, Robert Elliott, 1867-1947.
The Christian man, the church and the
by Robert E. Speer. -- New York : Macmi
1918.
105p. ; 17cm.

1. European war, 1914-1918--Religiou
I. Title.

A27978

CCSC